

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/658,784 | 09/11/2000 | Ivo Raaijmakers | ASMEX.236A | 4439 |
| 20995 | 7590 - 07/31/2002 | | | |
| | MARTENS OLSON & | EXAMINER | | |
| 620 NEWPC | ORT CENTER DRIVE | ZERVIGON, RUDY | | |
| | BEACH, CA 92660 | | _ | |
| NEWIORI | EACH, CA 92000 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | . " | 1763 | 12 |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/31/2002 | • —, |
| | .49 | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Nurillick(SP?

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

| , in | | | | | | | ASI | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| | · | | | Applicati i | No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
| | | Action Summary | | 09/658,784 | l . | RAAIJMAKERS E | T AL. | | |
| • | Offic | | | Examiner | | Art Unit | | | |
| | | | | Rudy Zervi | | 1763 | | | |
| Period fo | | ING DATE of this c mmu | nication ap | pears on the | cover sheet with the d | rrespondence ad | dress | | |
| THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r | MAILING D nsions of time m SIX (6) MONTH period for reply period for reply re to reply within reply received b | STATUTORY PERIOD IN ATE OF THIS COMMUNITY BY A WAY IN A W | IICATION. Is of 37 CFR 1. Imunication. (30) days, a replatatutory period by will, by statut | 136(a). In no ever ply within the statut I will apply and will te, cause the applic | t, however, may a reply be tin ory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| 1)🛛 | Responsi | ve to communication(s) | filed on <u>08</u> | May 2002 . | | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ | This action | on is FINAL . | 2b)□ T | his action is r | on-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | | |
| -4)⊠ | Claim(s) | <u>1-61 and 63-67</u> is/are per | nding in the | e application. | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the | above claim(s) <u>23-56</u> is/a | are withdra | wn from cons | ideration. | | | | |
| 5)⊠ | Claim(s) 7 | <u>'-13,22 and 61</u> is/are allo | wed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ | 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6,15-21,57,58 and 63-66</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | | | |
| 7)🖂 | Claim(s) 1 | 4, 59, 60, and 67 is/are o | bjected to | | • | | | | |
| 8)[| Claim(s) _ | are subject to restr | iction and/ | or election re | quirement. | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | • | | | | | | | |
| 9)[| The specifi | cation is objected to by the | ne Examin | er. | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 May 2002</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | | |
| 11)🛛 | The propos | ed drawing correction file | ed on <u>06 N</u> | <u>1ay 2002</u> is: a |)⊠ approved b)⊡ d | isapproved by the | Examiner. | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | | | | |
| 12) | The oath or | declaration is objected t | o by the E | xaminer. | | | | | |
| Priority u | inder 35 U | .S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | |
| 13) | Acknowled | dgment is made of a clair | n for foreig | gn priority und | ler 35 U.S.C. § 119(a | ı)-(d) or (f). | | | |
| a)[| ☐ All b)□ |] Some * c)☐ None of: | | | | | | | |
| | 1. Cert | tified copies of the priorit | y documer | nts have been | received. | | | | |
| • | 2. Cert | tified copies of the priority | y documer | nts have been | received in Applicati | on No | | | |
| * 5 | | ies of the certified copies application from the Inter ached detailed Office acti | national B | ureau (PCT F | Rule 17.2(a)). | | Stage | | |
| \ | | ment is made of a claim | | | · | | l application). | | |
| a |) 🔲 The tr | anslation of the foreign la | inguage pr | rovisional app | lication has been red | eived. | , | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) | | | | · · | | | | |
| 2) Notic | e of Draftsper | es Cited (PTO-892) rson's Patent Drawing Review (sure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) | | | | y (PTO-413) Paper No Patent Application (PT | | | |

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

- 1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign mentioned in the description: "206" (sealing portion, Page 16, lines 17-19 Figure 11A). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.
- 2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign not mentioned in the description: "406" (Figure 11A). A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Page 1

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/658,784

Art Unit: 1763

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-6, 15-21, 57, 58, and 63-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joe Wytman (EP0834907A2).

Joe Wytman describes:

- 1. A load lock (item 10, Figures 1-3; column 6, lines 12-23) that defines at least partially a first chamber (item 14, Figures 1-3; column 6, lines 12-23) and an auxiliary chamber (item 30/12, Figures 1-3; column 7, lines 17-50), the load lock comprising:
- a first port (item 18, Figures 1-3; column 6, lines 8-10) and a second port (item 16, Figures 1-3; column 6, lines 1-6), the first and second ports for moving a wafer into and out of the load lock; an elevator plate (item 22, Figures 1-3; column 6, lines 12-23) including a wafer carrier (item 11, Figures 1-3; column 6, lines 1-11) that is adapted for receiving a plurality of wafers (items W, Figures 1-3; column 5, lines 54-58); and the wafer carrier being moveable (items 26, 28; Figures 1-3; column 6, lines 24-42) between a first position (Figure 3) where the wafer carrier is in the first chamber and a, second position (Figure 2) where the wafer carrier is in the auxiliary chamber and the elevator plate substantially seals (items 32, 24; Figures 1-3; column 7, lines 17-50) the auxiliary chamber from the first chamber.

Art Unit: 1763

- 2. A load lock as set forth in Claim 1, wherein the load lock is formed at least in part by a first housing portion (item 14,Fig.1-3;column 6,lines12-23) and an auxiliary housing portion that is removably (26,28,34; Fig.1-3; column 6, lines24-42,column 7,lines25-30) coupled to the first portion (item 14,Fig.13;column 6,lines12-23).
- 4. 8. A load lock port as set forth in Claim 7, wherein the load lock comprises a first housing portion and an auxiliary housing portion that at least partially defines (see common wall, Fig.1-3) the auxiliary chamber, the first and second ports being located on the first housing portion.
- 5. 10. A load lock as set forth in Claim 9, wherein the first port communicates with a wafer handling module (item 102,Fig.1-3;column 9,lines19-47).
- 6. 18. A load lock as set forth in Claim 1, wherein the auxiliary chamber includes inner walls (volume enclosing item 30) that are adapted to withstand an auxiliary fluid (column 7, lines 51-58).
- 7. 20. A load lock as set forth in Claim 1, wherein the load lock further includes heating elements (item 47, Figure 1; column 7, lines 54-55).
- 8. 21. A load lock as set forth in Claim 20, wherein the heating elements are located within the auxiliary chamber.
- 9. 57. A system for processing substrates, comprising a load lock chamber including a lower portion having a first inner width and an upper portion (item 30/12, Figures 1-3; column 7, lines 17-50) having a narrower second inner width (Figures 1-3, where 47's rest), the chamber

Art Unit: 1763

including a first port and a second port, each of the ports sized to pass substrates there through, the load lock chamber further comprising a moveable platform, with shelves (holding wafers "W"), configured to support at least one substrate thereon and sized to have a width (Figures 1-3) less than the first inner width (Figures 1-3) and greater than the second inner width to enable selectively sealing the upper portion with the at least one substrate supported thereon and including gas injectors (40, 44; Fig.1); an auxiliary processing system, or "auxiliary processing solution source" (page 7, lines 8-13), described by Wytman as items 40 and 44 of Figure 1; Wytman eludes to clean room connectivity of the load lock chamber (column 1, lines 23-24). However, Joe Wytman does not describe:

- 10. 1. A wafer carrier that is <u>attached</u> or is not attached to the elevator plate.
- 11. 15. A load lock wherein the load lock further includes a second elevator plate The reproduction of apparatus components has been held to obvious. See MPEP 2144.04.
- 12. 57. At least one process chamber selectively communicating with the substrate handling chamber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to <u>attach</u> the Wytman wafer carrier to the elevator plate.

Motivation for attaching the Wytman wafer carrier to the elevator plate is drawn from the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made where such an attachment would insure that the wafer carrier would not tip over during transfer between Wytman's upper chamber

Art Unit: 1763

12 and Wytman's lower chamber 14 so that robot 102 would secure and transfer the wafer onto

further processing (column 9, lines 19-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to add an additional elevator plate above or below the Wytman elevator plate (22).

Motivation for adding an additional elevator plate above or below the Wytman elevator plate

(22) is drawn from the level of ordinary skill in the art whereby by adding additional elevator

plates the seal between Wytman's chambers 14 and 12, for a constant force provided through

conveying mechanism 26, would provide enhanced hermeticity between these chambers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to selectively communicate at least one process chamber with the substrate handling chamber

(item 100, Figure 1).

Motivation for selectively communicating at least one process chamber with the substrate

handling chamber is drawn from the level of ordinary skill in the art and is discussed by Joe

Wytman (column 1, lines 13-24), and is directed to "processing typically occurs within high

vacuum process chambers".

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/658,784 Page 6

Art Unit: 1763

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 7-13, 22 and 61 are allowed.

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art to claim 22 is to Joe Wytman (EP0834907A2) who teaches a load lock wherein the heating elements are located upon the "sub-chamber"/ "upper chamber" interface (auxiliary chamber 30, Fig.1) as apposed to the elevator plate as claimed. The closest prior art to claim 61 is to Joe Wytman (EP0834907A2) who teaches wherein the first port, as defined in claim 61 as the interface between the "substrate handling chamber" and the "load lock chamber" is located in the lower portion (item 14,Figures 1-3) of the load lock. However, amended claim 61 requires that the first port be located in the upper portion. Claim 7 now requires "first and second ports open into said first chamber when said elevator plate is in said second position". The closest prior art to Joe Wytman (EP0834907A2) teaches a second position (Figure 2) for the elevator plate 22. However, the elevator plate and associated seals do not permit second port (16, Figure 1) to "open into said first chamber" (14, Figures 1,2).

5. Claims 14, 59, 60, and 67 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1763

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed May 8, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- 2. Applicant's position that it would not have been obvious to attach Wytman's wafer carrier to the elevator plate is not convincing. In particular, temporarily affixed wafer cassettes on elevated platforms are common in the art and serve to stabilize the cassette platforms along the transit of the wafers.
- Applicant's position that "..the second elevator plate is not a mere reproduction of an 3. apparatus component because the second elevator plate has an entirely different function than the first elevator plate. Specifically, the second elevator plate substantially seals the auxiliary chamber from the first chamber when the wafer carrier is in the second position." is acknowledged as shown in Figure 11a. However, to the identical credit accorded the Wytman (EP0834907A2) patent, Wytman offers an elevator plate (22, Figure 1) that "substantially seals [24, Figure 1] the auxiliary chamber [12] from the first chamber [14] when the wafer carrier is in the second position [Figure 1,2]." Additional elevator plates as item 26, Figure 11 of the present application would be obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. As stated in the prior office action, "motivation for adding an additional elevator plateabove or below the Wytman elevator plate (22) is drawn from the level of ordinary skill in the art whereby by adding additional elevator plates the seal between Wytman's chambers 14 and 12, for a constant force provided through conveying mechanism 26, would provide enhanced hermeticity between these chambers.". Moreover, those of ordinary skill in the art would consider adding additional elevator plates to the Wytman apparatus when a fewer number of

Art Unit: 1763

wafers are processed or the height of the wafer carrier is shorter than the height of the heating elements (47, Figure 1) for heating the region within the sub-chamber as discussed by Wytman (column 7, lines 54-56).

- 4. With respect to Applicant's position that Wytman does not teach an "auxiliary chamber includes inner walls that are adapted to withstand an auxiliary fluid and wherein said auxiliary fluid comprises HF vapor" because Wytman only teaches "a load lock, which is configured to heat and degas the wafer with an inert gas" is not convincing. Specifically, it is well established that apparatus claims are distinguished from the prior art in terms of structural limitations. See MPEP 2114.
- 5. In response to applicant's argument that "Such cassettes are not configured for withstanding processing gases, such as, for example HF vapor.", and "the treatment gas injectors [in the upper chamber] communicate with a source of HF vapor", and "the treatment gas injectors [in the upper chamber] communicate with an oxidant source", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).
- 6. With respect to Applicant's position that Wytman does not teach "a load lock chamber including a lower portion having a first inner width and an upper portion attached to the lower portion.". It is established that Wytman does teach a load lock chamber with a lower portion (14)

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/658,784

Art Unit: 1763

having a first inner width and an upper portion (item 30/12, Figures 1-3; column 7, lines 17-50)

attached to the lower portion as shown in Figure 1.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (703) 305-

1351. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am

through 7pm. The official after final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9311.

The official before final fax phone number for the 1763 art unit is (703) 872-9310. Any Inquiry

of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to

the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (703) 308-0661. If the examiner

can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills, at (703) 308-

1633.

GREGORY MILLS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700